

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action the Examiner has objected to some of claims because of certain noted informalities. These generally deal with a lack of antecedent basis. Applicant has amended each of the objected to claims providing the correct antecedent basis.

In addition, claims 1-4 and 13 have been rejected as anticipated by the patent to Wu et al. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5, the independent claims herein to emphasize the fact that the broadened laser beam flux passes through the dust protective covering while part of the broadened laser beam flux is then reflected back into the interior or the apparatus. This does not occur with Wu et al. in that Wu et al. as the Examiner noted in the Office Action Wu et al. has openings near elements 6, 7 and 8 through which the laser beam travels. Wu et al. does not pass his laser beam through the protective covering as in the subject application. Accordingly, Applicant believes that Wu et al. cannot anticipate the subject invention as now claimed. Further Wu et al. cannot reflect a portion of his laser beam into the interior of the apparatus insofar as there is no medium to reflect from.

Claims 5-12 and 14 have also been rejected as unpatentable over Wu et al. As stated above, Applicant has amended claim 5 and now specifically recites that the laser beam flux travels through the protective cover and reflects a portion of the laser beam flux into the interior of the apparatus. Wu et al.'s apparatus cannot accomplish this insofar as Wu et al.'s laser beam does not pass through the protective cover and Wu et al.'s laser beam cannot be reflected back into the interior of the apparatus. In addition there is no suggestion in Wu et al. that his apparatus be changed so that this might occur. As the Examiner states Wu et al. also fails to teach cylindrical rod lens. The Examiner has concluded that it would be obvious to one of skill in the optic art to provide more control to the modulation of light and thus it would have been obvious to so modify the Wu et al. system. However, the Examiner has provided any support for this contention and accordingly it is not a valid rejection of the claims, being simply speculation by the Examiner.

Further, the Examiner states that Wu et al. lacks clear teaching of a reflective surface on the inter surface of the protective covering. The Examiner has concluded that it would have been obvious to modify Wu et al. to form a reflecting surface on the inter surface of the protective covering in order to provide reflected light there from. However since Wu et al. does not shine his laser beam on the protective cover this would not result in the apparatus claimed herein. Further there is no support for the Examiner's statement that forming a reflective surface on an innersurface of the protective covering would have been obvious to one of skill in the art. Accordingly, such a rejection must fail.

With regard to claims 6 and 7, the Examiner states that Wu et al. fails to teach that the first dust protective covering member comprises at least a pair of covering elements where the second covering element is flattened with a curvature formed on the internal surface. The Examiner states that supplying the additional covering element with a specific shape would have been obvious in order to provide a desired direction of the emitting light. However, there is no support for this statement, and accordingly such a rejection cannot stand. The Examiner has made similar rejections to claims 8 and 9 stating that it would have been obvious to (for claim 8) use hold frames to connect or hold the first and second covering elements and (claim 9) teach that the first and second covering elements are connected to each other at a portion where they are posed to and formed integrally with each other. Again the Examiner has not provided any teaching in the art to support his statement that such was known and thus would have been obvious in combination with Wu to accomplish such structure. As a result such rejection cannot stand.

The Examiner has applied the same rational with regards to claims 10, 11, 12 and 14, providing no teaching in the art which might be combined with Wu et al. to provide the structure claimed. Accordingly the Examiner's rejection cannot stand in any of these rejections and as such Applicant believes that the claims 5-12 and 14 are not obvious over the art of record.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination of the subject application.

With the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes that this application is ready for allowance and earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.



Gerald T. Shekleton
Registration No. 27,466

Dated: **October 3, 2005**
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3912
Telephone: (312) 655-1500
Facsimile: (312) 655-1501